THE HON'BLE SRI BILAL NAZKI,
THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

WRIT APPEAL No.956 of 2007

Dated: 22-11-2007

Between:

P.Vasudev Reddy.

....APPELLANT

AND

1.The Collector/Chairman H.D.S.,
M.G.M.Hospital, Warangal,
Warangal District & 4 others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI BILAL NAZKI,
THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

Writ Appeal No.956 of 2007

Dated: 22-11-2007

Judgment: **(Per Hon'ble Sri Bilal Nazki, The Acting Chief Justice)**

This Writ Appeal has been filed by the appellant-petitioner aggrieved by a common judgment dated 27-06-2007 passed by a learned single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.573 of 2006, C.C.Nos.66 & 70 of 2006.

The appellant was awarded the diet contract for

supply of diet to the patients and inmates of MGM Hospital initially for a period of one year from 01-05-2003 to 31-05-2004 and again for another period of one year from 05-06-2004 to 31.05.2005 The grievance of the appellant is that in terms of G.O.Ms.No.32 dated 02-02-2005, he is entitled to continue as diet contractor even after 31-05-2005 for a period of three years, but the respondents-authorities have finalized the contract in favour of the fifth respondent. The Writ Petition being W.P.No.573 of 2006 filed by the appellant challenging the finalisation of contract in favour of the fifth respondent has been dismissed. Hence, the present appeal.

Heard the learned Counsel for the appellant and also the learned Government Pleader for Medical & Health appearing for the respondents. Perused the material available on record.

The appellant's contract initially came into effect from 01-05-2003 and later on as per the agreement dated
05-06-2004, it was extended up to 31-05-2004. Subsequently, on a representation made by the petitioner, the contract period was temporarily extended till 8th January, 2006. Even if the petitioner had been given the benefit under G.O.Ms.No.32 dated 02-02-2005, which he claims, even then his contract period as per the agreement dated 05-06-2004 would have been over by 4th June, 2007. That period is already over and some alternative arrangement must have been made. Therefore, we do not think that any interference is required in the order passed by the learned single

Judge

The Writ Appeal is misconceived and it is accordingly, dismissed. It is made clear that we have not given any opinion about the applicability of G.O.Ms.No.32 dated
02-02-2005. However, if the petitioner feels that a damage has been caused to him, he may take alternative remedies, which may be available to him in law. No costs.

_____

(Bilal Nazki, A.C.J)

Dated 22st November, 2007

_____

(Ramesh Ranganathan, J)

lur